

Strengthening Teacher Preparation Over Time: A History of University of Hawai'i Teacher Education Programs, 1986–2003

Randy Hitz and Frank Walton
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, College of Education

A New Institute for Teacher Education

In fall 2002, the University of Hawai'i at Manoa (UHM) Board of Regents approved a new structure for teacher education programs in the College of Education (COE). The new Institute for Teacher Education (ITE) provides coordinated oversight for four programs: the Bachelor of Education (BEd) in Elementary Education, Bachelor of Education (BEd) in Secondary Education, Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Secondary Education (PBCSE), and Master of Education in Teaching (MET).

The ITE programs share important characteristics. All programs are field-based. Students spend one to two days per week working in school classrooms during the semesters leading up to full-time (i.e., five days per week) student teaching and teaching internship semesters. Field experiences, student teaching, and teaching internships are integrated with the university coursework required to complete each program.

University faculty partner with school administrators and mentor teachers to support and assess the progress of students throughout their programs. The programs incorporate experiences in planning, implementation, and assessment of national and state teacher standards and student content and performance standards. The programs share a common mission and conceptual framework that runs throughout College of Education undergraduate and graduate programs.

The following values and principles provide the foundation for all activities in the College of Education and reflect desired dispositions of professional educators (college students and faculty). These values and principles are threaded throughout the vision and the goals of the college, as indicated below. We believe professional educators in a multi-cultural, democratic society should be

- ❖ **KNOWLEDGEABLE**—possess content and procedural knowledge, as well as an understanding of human development and learning;
- ❖ **COLLABORATIVE**—work congenially with colleagues, other professionals, and members of the educational community;
- ❖ **INCLUSIVE**—incorporate multiple perspectives, respect diversity, and honor democratic principles;
- ❖ **INQUIRING**—ask critical questions and work to integrate theory and practice; and
- ❖ **REFLECTIVE**—thoughtful and constantly reflecting upon one's own standards, performance, and ethics.

Assessment data collected from students, school administrators, and mentor teachers indicate positive response to ITE programs, which actively engage students, university faculty members, school-level mentor teachers, and administrators in collaborative efforts to prepare new teachers. The data also provide ongoing feedback for program improvement. These standards- and field-based teacher education programs, grounded in a shared vision for education, are a relatively new development in UHM's teacher preparation history. The purpose of this article is to trace the history of UHM's teacher education from 1986 through present day, noting the important movements and events that provided impetus for change, and to highlight the major challenges that lie ahead.

Beginnings

In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education published the report, *A National at Risk*, which identified shortcomings in America's public schooling. In the public's perception, traditional teacher preparation practices in colleges of education were perceived as part of a larger problem that needed to be solved.

Until the mid-1980s, the UHM College of Education teacher preparation programs followed recommendations set forth by Lindley Stiles, Dean of the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin. The Stiles Report (1966) criticized the emphasis placed on professional education coursework and the length of time, often five years, required for most students to complete their education degrees. The College of Education therefore took steps to streamline its teacher preparation programs to bring them into line with changing programs across the nation (Potter and Logan, 1995). The COE reduced the number of required credits, established a sequence of courses to be delivered with assembly-line efficiency, and topped the coursework off with eight credits of clinical experience or student teaching. This system of program delivery was efficient, but the division of study into discrete course and student teaching units provided no clear, overall sense of mission or purpose. Students completed the obligatory series of course units and only then were they allowed to “practice teach” with real children in real classrooms. Students’ experiences in university and school classrooms were poorly integrated and only vaguely connected.

Reform in teacher preparation practices in the College of Education began in 1986. During fall of that year, COE Dean John Dolly helped create and launch a new Hawai’i School-University Partnership (HSUP). The HSUP marked a new partnership among three major institutions: the University of Hawai’i College of Education, the Hawai’i State Department of Education (DOE), and the Kamehameha Schools, an independent school dedicated to educating students of native Hawaiian ancestry. The HSUP brought together COE faculty members, Arts and Sciences faculty members, public and private school administrators and educators, and community members in a new relationship to discuss and improve K–12 education.

The HSUP members forged links with educators in other states, organizations, and colleges of education across the country. The HSUP’s involvement in two organizations, the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER), developed by John Goodlad, and the Holmes Group, was especially important in promoting new ideas and fresh thinking related to preparing teachers in Hawai’i.

John Goodlad’s work (1990, 1994) has been instrumental in providing guidance and recommendations on how education institutions might work together to develop higher standards and expectations for pedagogy and learning. Goodlad brought educators together from diverse settings to tackle the challenges of providing better teacher education programs. In a change from traditional practice, Goodlad encouraged group efforts to solve problems rather than institutions’ continuing to go it alone. Membership in the Holmes Group helped the COE focus further attention on specific ideas for reform in teacher education programs.

During this time, a new conceptualization of teaching as a complex and intellectually demanding professional undertaking began to emerge nationally. Questioning the assumptions of the prevailing behaviorist model of teaching (Shulman, 1986), researchers began to investigate the knowledge base and thinking processes of teaching. Concepts of reflection, collaboration, and inquiry entered conversations about teacher education. By 1992, a new generation of teacher educators, who were deeply committed to teaching and to conducting research to better understand teaching, was firmly in place at UHM.

Many UHM senior faculty members were equally committed to teacher education reform. These faculty members had participated in earlier endeavors, such as the 1973 Innovative Program, a field-centered, secondary education program that placed teaching interns in public school classrooms throughout their teacher education programs. The senior faculty members helped establish partnerships with teachers and schools through their knowledge of the local school system, and their efforts were essential in making new programs successful. In addition, senior faculty members often were better placed than new, untenured faculty members, to devote the time and energy needed to launch new programs.

Authorization for New Planning

In 1987, the UHM Vice-President for Academic Affairs signed a “Request for Authorization to Plan.” The request stated that

There is a national movement in the United States to upgrade teacher training. The faculty has

made a commitment to move in this direction and we are collectively interested in developing the College of Education as a professional college on a par with other professional schools and colleges in the University . . . The College is a charter member of the Holmes Group and is dedicated to having a fully developed graduate level program for training teachers within the next five years.

A Holmes Group Planning Committee was established to include UHM faculty members, DOE administrators, public school principals and teachers, representatives from the Hawai'i State Teachers Association (HSTA), faculty members from Kamehameha Schools, and the Executive Director of the HSUP. Although this committee was too large to do the kind of detailed planning required for programmatic reform, it provided an energetic forum for debate and helped identify important issues for smaller working groups. These groups explored a wide range of alternatives with the aim of generating workable teacher education program models for deliberation among the larger group. A "winning" model for a new Master of Education in Teaching degree emerged, based on these important principles.

1. The program would involve the various constituent groups—faculty, teachers, principals, and teacher candidates—in program decision-making.
2. The program would stress reflective practice and group work.
3. Students would be arranged in cohort groups and assigned to partnership schools.
4. The curriculum would stress inquiry and prepare teachers who would see themselves as teacher researchers.
5. The students' field experiences would be integrated with college coursework and take place during each semester of the two-year program.
6. Learning to teach would be viewed within the context of ongoing school renewal and teacher professional development.

The Master of Education in Teaching

The new Master of Education in Teaching (MET) began in fall 1991 with a cohort of 25 students, 15 in elementary education and 10 in secondary education. The two-year master's level degree program in teacher education provided simultaneous opportunities for the professional development of participating teachers at five partner schools on the island of Oahu.

The MET continues today and has a unique governance structure that allows for shared decision-making among its various participant groups. The MET Executive Council is made up of COE faculty members, MET student representatives, and partner school teachers and principals. The council meets once per month throughout the school year to discuss ideas and reach consensus on program issues.

The College admits one new MET cohort of approximately 25 students each fall semester. The cohorts includes both elementary and secondary teacher education students. Students begin the MET program with a one-week orientation that acquaints them with program expectations and the opportunity to get to know fellow students. MET students receive e-mail accounts and learn to use IT resources to assist their research. Their first major assignment, "Inquiry into Inquiry," provides an introduction to the process of group inquiry, an integral part of the instructional approach of the MET program. At the end of their first week, groups make formal presentations to peers and faculty members on what they have learned about inquiry as a result of their group research.

The orientation week is followed by two weeks of immersion (i.e., every day) in public school classrooms. This immersion period coincides with the start of the DOE school year and launches the field-based portion of the program. Students help their mentor teachers set up classrooms, observe the opening days of school, gain an immediate appreciation for the demands of teaching, and give serious consideration early in the program to teaching as their career choice.

After immersion, a new routine of field experience begins. At this point, students spend a minimum of 15 hours per week in partner school classrooms. Three of these hours are devoted to a Field Experience Seminar, facilitated by the

UHM faculty and attended during the last hour by the students' mentor teachers. The seminar provides regular opportunities to discuss observations, ask questions, and begin the process of becoming a thoughtful, reflective teacher who can converse with other professionals on important pedagogic issues. Students spend at least 12 hours per week visiting and working in a variety of school classrooms and observing the work of schools overall. The main objective of the first semester is to study the culture of the whole school. Students work together to produce and present a "School Portrait" that describes what they have learned about the culture of a particular partner school (Marble, 1997).

During their first semester, students participate in a further six hours of instruction on the UHM campus as part of the Professional Studies Seminar. They work in small groups to discuss and inquire into a variety of educational topics, such as learning theory, curriculum development, educational technology, research in teaching, and classroom community building and management. They make presentations to peers and faculty members about their research.

During the second semester, students follow a similar pattern of field experience and professional studies. In the partner schools, they focus more closely on connecting their learning to classroom application by teaming to plan and teach two thematic units of two weeks duration. Students work in pairs with their chosen mentor teachers to complete their thematic units. During the second semester, they also select additional teacher preparation courses, in areas such as teaching reading or mathematics, to round out their program of study.

During the summer session, most students take other university courses to further prepare them as teachers. They use the summer months to coplan with the mentor teachers with whom they will partner in the fall. Students can elect to take a curriculum development or action research course set up for this purpose. This course provides a rare opportunity for teachers and students to meet, become better acquainted, and design innovative teaching and assessment strategies for the third semester. COE faculty members have focused research projects on this innovative process of using teacher-

student teams to reinvent the student teaching practicum (Phelan, McEwan, & Pateman, 1996; McEwan, Field, Kawamoto, & Among, 1997).

Summer session also provides time for students to begin work on their "Plan B Papers," the culminating academic assignment of the MET program. The papers usually take the form of an action research project conducted during their third semester when they student teach.

The student teaching practicum during the third semester is a departure from the experience provided in more traditional programs. As in most programs, students are in schools all day, every day. However, a major portion of this time, approximately eight hours per week, is devoted to planning and reflection. The school-based field seminar, included as part of the eight hours, is held one afternoon per week. During this time, students meet with their faculty advisors to discuss classroom issues, plan lessons and related assessments, and work on Plan B projects. The students' mentor teachers frequently attend these sessions and earn professional development credit for participation.

The fourth and final semester of the MET program is a paid teaching internship in a public school, during which MET students are assigned to fill vacant teaching positions on Oahu. The DOE's Office of Personnel Services works closely with MET faculty members to facilitate these placements. This period can be an anxious one for students. After one and a half years of preparation in familiar partner schools, most are about to enter new schools and classrooms to deal with new colleagues and school pupils. The MET faculty members continue to visit the interns in their classrooms and provide support in these new situations.

The change in teaching environment is less abrupt for four MET students, who take over as teachers in the classrooms of four teachers in the partner schools. These mentor teachers now serve as "intern mentors" during the fourth semester. The role of the intern mentor is to collaborate with MET faculty to visit student interns regularly in their classrooms and provide instructional support. Intern mentors also use this time to pursue a professional development plan of their choosing, with many enrolling in UHM courses.

The MET program is highly regarded by Hawai'i's public school teachers and principals, who are eager to hire

program graduates. As of summer 2003, approximately 220 students had graduated from the program. MET graduates are perceived and perceive themselves as well prepared to begin their teaching careers. MET graduates tend to remain in teaching—the attrition rate is low. December 1998 figures indicate that of 107 MET graduates, 73 were teaching in public schools in Hawai'i, five were teaching in private schools, eight were teaching in other states, and three were teaching abroad. MET graduates are also beginning to move into positions of leadership in their schools. One graduate has become an elementary school principal, and five graduates are enrolled in doctoral programs in education.

Changes in Other Teacher Education Programs

Elementary Education

Shortly after the MET program began in 1991, similar kinds of reforms began to take place in the Elementary and Early Childhood Education (EECE) program. All elementary education teacher candidates now progress through this two-year program in cohort groups of approximately 25 students. The cohorted EECE program allows each student to belong to and become genuinely involved in a learning community. Cohort students take their professional coursework as a group, participate in field experience and student teaching in a community of partner schools, and develop close working relationships with faculty members who teach their methods courses and oversee their classroom experiences. "Cohort coordinators," UHM faculty members who direct the progress of a particular group of students, maintain close working relationships with mentor teachers and principals in partner schools. Cohort coordinators ensure that students' classroom experiences link closely with their university coursework and that K–6 mentor teachers and principals are involved in decision-making about the program.

Special Education

Special education teachers are prepared through master's degree, post-baccalaureate certificate, and dual preparation programs. Teacher candidates in the dual preparation program in elementary education and special

education complete their program in inclusive education cohorts, similar to the EECE program.

The MEd program in special education is a basic licensure program. Students are organized in cohort and required to complete 12 credits of field experience. Because many of the students in the MEd program are working as non-certified teachers due to the special education teacher shortage in Hawai'i, the Special Education Department has been collaborating with administrators, teachers, and the DOE Recruitment Support Center (RRSC) to develop a mentor program to support these teachers in the field. A pilot program, based on the New Teacher Center (NTC) model developed by the University of California-Santa Cruz, was set up in cooperation with several school sites, in spring 2003. In fall 2003, the DOE joined this collaborative effort by participating in the training of 40–50 new mentors based at various school complexes. The goal is for all MEd students and first year special education teachers to have a site-based mentor by spring 2004. Research from the NTC indicates that retention rates, pedagogy, and student achievement all improve using this mentoring model.

Teacher candidates in the dual preparation program in elementary education and special education follow the model of the EECE cohort program. They participate as a learning community in a partner school. However, they are also required to complete, in addition to their regular education coursework, thirty credits of special education coursework that includes field experiences and student teaching in a variety of settings such as a special education resource room, self-contained classroom, and inclusive classroom. Plans are being made to integrate more of the general education and special education coursework to reduce the credit load on students in this program.

Secondary Education

The COE conducts two teacher preparation programs in secondary education in addition to the MET: the Bachelor of Education program (BEd) and the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Secondary Education (PBSCE). The secondary BEd and PBCSE programs will move to a cohort model in 2004. Students will enter the program in cohort groups of approximately 25 and take most of their courses together through-

out the one-and-a-half year program. New cohort coordinators for the secondary programs ensure that students' field experiences in middle and high school classrooms are more closely integrated with their university coursework. Students in a cohort will work in communities of secondary schools, so that they have peer colleagues with whom to share experiences in their assigned schools.

Statewide Outreach Distance Education

In 2002, the COE brought a new Director of Statewide Outreach Programs on board to assist faculty members in designing and delivering undergraduate and graduate programs through distance education. In addition, COE hired new Outreach Coordinators on the islands of Maui, Kauai, and Hawai'i. The Elementary BEd and Secondary PBCSE programs are ready to be offered as web-based and hybrid (i.e., online and face-to-face participation) courses to students on all neighbor islands across the state. These programs are organized to include groups of Neighbor Island and rural Oahu students who will complete their coursework together. The first statewide PBCSE cohort began during fall 2003; a new statewide PBCSE cohort will be admitted each fall. The first statewide Elementary BEd cohort will begin during summer 2004; a new elementary statewide cohort will be admitted every two years.

Administrative Changes in Teacher Education

Admissions Criteria

During the past decade, teacher education program admission policies have become more rigorous and admission standards higher. Applicants to the BEd and PBCSE programs must have grade point averages of 2.75 or higher. Applicants must submit passing scores on all three sections of the Praxis I Pre-Professional Skills Test. In addition, PBCSE and MET applicants in secondary education must submit passing scores on Praxis II Content Exams in their field of study.

Center for Pedagogy

The College of Education is working toward creating a Center for Pedagogy in keeping with the recommendations of John Goodlad (1994) as "a vehicle for bringing together

partner schools and elements of the arts and sciences and schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs)." In 1996, the College integrated its existing Division of Field Services and Department of Curriculum and Instruction into a single unit designated as the Department of Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies (TECS). The rationale for this merger was to ensure that field experiences and student teaching were closely linked to university instruction. The merger also required teacher education faculty members throughout the new TECS department to work more closely with mentor teachers and principals in partner schools to develop programs with greater theoretical and structural coherence.

The COE moved closer to a Center for Pedagogy in 2002 through the approval and implementation of the new Institute for Teacher Education, which houses all teacher preparation program except Special Education. The Institute for Teacher Education and the Department of Special Education collaborate closely. However, the large size of the respective units precludes their being brought into one institute or department at this time. The ITE Director also works closely with other department chairs and faculty members (i.e., the Departments of Curriculum Studies, Educational Foundations, Educational Psychology, Educational Technology, Kinesiology and Leisure Science, and the Curriculum Research & Development Group) that contribute to COE teacher education programs.

Hawai'i Institute for Educational Partnerships

In 1999, the Hawai'i School University Partnership was renamed the Hawai'i Institute for Educational Partnerships (HIEP). The three directors of HIEP represent COE, DOE, and the UHM College of Arts and Sciences. HIEP members work closely with the ITE Director and other department chairs to ensure program coherence and productive relationships with partner schools. COE department chairs involved in teacher preparation programs comprise a new ITE Council of Chairs, who meet monthly to discuss and make decisions about teacher education programs. The Council of Chairs deals with issues such as curriculum coordination, field experience, scheduling, and staffing for teacher education.

The Role of National Accreditation

In 2001, the College of Education earned accreditation from the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Previously, COE accreditation operated at the state level through the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

The rigorous process of meeting the high standards for NCATE accreditation strengthened COE teacher education programs in important ways. Faculty members met in a series of retreats to articulate a conceptual framework for all programs in the COE. Developing the conceptual framework enabled faculty members to build a shared vision and reach consensus on core values, program principles, and major theoretical underpinnings of COE teacher preparation and professional development programs. The values inherent in COE's work with NNER and the development of the MET program are illustrated in the conceptual framework.

In addition to the integration of the conceptual framework across teacher education programs, preparation for the NCATE accreditation process led to the development of a well-defined assessment system to track candidate and program progress. The ITE assessment system is linked with the COE conceptual framework and the Hawai'i Teacher Standards set by the Hawai'i Teacher Standards Board. The assessment system facilitates methodical review of students and programs over time at important transition points, including admission, early in the program, during the middle of the program as student prepare for student teaching, late in the program during student teaching or internship, graduation, and after graduation. The COE also conducts annual surveys of alumni, mentor teachers, and principals to gather information about the quality of teacher preparation programs.

Evidence of Progress

Partnership with NNER and the development of the new Hawai'i Institute for Educational Partnerships has provided valuable opportunities for faculty members in the College of Education, the College of Arts and Sciences, and K–12 schools to engage in ongoing discussions and decision-

making related to renewal issues with each other and with educators across the nation. These strong relationships support quality in UHM teacher education programs. A strong sense of renewal is evident in COE's Teacher Education Committees (TECs), which deal with important issues in specific content areas (e.g., Teacher Education Committee on Science) and programs (e.g., Teacher Education Committee on Elementary Education). HIEP has helped generate other partnership groups, including the ITE Council of Chairs and the Hawai'i Educational Policy Center. As a result, teacher education programs have emerged with a new and effective organizational structure.

Annual survey data indicate positive trends in teacher education program improvement. Teacher candidates have expressed increasing satisfaction with their professional preparation during the past ten years. Similarly, principals and mentor teacher survey data indicate that COE graduates are meeting or exceeding the Hawai'i Teacher Standards. Focus group discussions with alumni, mentor teachers, and principals confirm survey trends and provide deeper insight into how teacher education programs have improved and can be improved.

Importantly, the teacher education programs that are most strongly field-based (i.e., the MET and EECE programs) receive the most positive ratings. The secondary program, which has provided far fewer field experience hours and has not yet been arranged into cohort groups, has been targeted as needing improvement. In response to these data, the teacher education faculty have made plans to cohort the secondary program, reinstate an Introduction to Teaching course, and consider increasing the number and quality of field experience hours required in the program.

The College of Education has improved its reputation both on and off campus. The College nurtures strong relationships with the College of Arts and Sciences, the Hawai'i Department of Education, the Hawai'i Teacher Standards Board, and the UHM administration. The administration has provided much needed financial support to the College, despite severe budget cuts in the state. This confidence in the College is further illustrated by a budget increase of \$750,000 for statewide outreach distance education programs designated for the neighbor islands.

Future Directions in Teacher Education

Improvement in teacher education is an ongoing process. The important reforms implemented to date have significantly improved the quality of teacher education programs and made the experiences of teacher candidates more meaningful and responsive to their needs as beginning teachers.

Important challenges remain. The Institute for Teacher Education and the Hawai'i Institute for Educational Partnerships must continue to strengthen relationships with partner schools, which are vital to program reform. COE must work with DOE to consistently support all partner schools so that they can meet the ideal of becoming professional development schools. Other than in the MET program, efforts to support professional development in partner schools has been incidental and informal at best. COE seeks to build a model of "continuous educational renewal in which colleges and universities . . . join schools . . . as equal partners in the simultaneous renewal of schooling and the education of educators" (Goodlad, 1994). Although state funding has been proposed for supporting professional development schools, the monies thus far have been cut in legislative session during difficult economic times in the state.

A second challenge has been the diverse response of faculty members to work in partner schools. Some have been unable to move comfortably between the two very different cultures of the public school and university. Although many faculty members relish their work in partner schools as part of their most important teaching and research, others feel that the time and effort required to work intensively in the field is too demanding and too difficult to reconcile with the demands of scholarship. Since the early 1990s, all new teacher education faculty positions have included the expectation that faculty members will work in partner schools and supervise field experiences. However, even new faculty members sometimes regard working in partner schools as a temporary assignment—one that ends after "paying one's dues" for several semesters. This response has made it difficult to recruit faculty for the heavily field-based MET program and has hindered efforts to implement needed changes in the secondary program.

A third major challenge is the tremendous need to produce more teachers each year. The College of Education is the major producer of teachers in Hawai'i and has a special responsibility to help meet the state's demand for teachers. However, during the past four years, the College of Education and other teacher education programs in the state together have been able to produce fewer than 600 teachers per year, in response to DOE's need for 1300 to 1500 teachers each year. Recruiting teachers from out of state is a temporary solution at best, especially since these teachers tend to stay and teach in Hawai'i only two or three years.

To address Hawai'i's teacher shortage, the College has broadened its routes to teacher licensure. The new statewide outreach distance education program will help produce more teachers in the high need areas of neighbor islands. The variety of routes attracts more teacher candidates but spreads resources thin. The College continues to seek ways to address teacher shortages while maintaining the high quality of teacher education programs established during the past decade.

References

- Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodlad, J. (1994). *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2.
- Marble, S. (1997). Narrative visions of schooling. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(1), 55–64.
- McEwan, H., Field, B. J., Kawamoto, S., & Among, M. (1997). Learning to Teach Through Action Research. *Action in Teacher Education*, 18 (4), 47–56
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Phelan, A., McEwan, H., & Pateman, N. (1996). Collaboration in student teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12 (4), 335–353.
- Potter, R. E. & Logan, L. L. (1995) *A History of Teacher Education in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: Hawai'i Education Association.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Paradigms and research programs in the study of teaching. In Wittrock (Ed.), *The Handbook of Research in Teaching*, New York: Macmillan, (pp. 3–36).
- Whitesell, P. A. (1973). IP: A field-centered alternative in teacher education. *Educational Perspectives*, 12 (2), 18–22.